Promotion in the Army by giving extension in service

1586. SHRI VEDPRAKASH P. GOYAL: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Major General was promoted to Lt. General by giving exten sion in service at the point of retirement;

(b) whether this action was against the recommendations of the Headquarters who had tuned down his request for extension and promotion;

(c) whether this action blocks the promotion of deserving officers;

(d) what circumstances led to the interference in well established procedure of promotions; and

(e) whether this favouritism has not created unrest among army officers as appeared in the Pioneer, New Delhi dated the 4th March,. 1997?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI N. V. N. SOMU): (a) to (e) The Major General who was granted short extension of three months is an 1962 batch General Cadre Offficer. On a statutory complaint submitted by the officer, the Government, after due consideration, found that some gradings and remarks in one of the officer's reports were inconsistent with the overall profile of the officer. As such he was granted redressal by way of ex-' punction of these gradings/remarks by the competent authority.

As per extant provisions, the officer, thereafter, became eligible to be considered again by the Selection Board as a Special Review (Fresh) case. He was accordingly considered along with some other officers by the Special Selection Board held on 31st October 1996. The Board recommended that he be graded 'unfit'. The gradings awarded by the special Selection Board, as endorsed by the COAS, were examined in the Ministry and it was considered that after granting of redressal, the overall record profile of the officer was comparable with those of his batch who were promoted. As such, the officer was finally graded as 'fit' by the competent authority.

In view of the time taken in deciding the matter of Statutory Complaint and the Board proceedings, it was ordered to grant a short extension in service to the officer by three months beyond his date of retimement on 30th November 1996, or till the declassification of result of the Special Selection Board held on 31st October 1996, whichever was earlier.

There was no interference in the well established procedure of promotion nor was there any favouritism in granting promotion to the officer.

भारतीय वायु सेना ग्राउण्ड ड्यूटी/फ्लाइंग अधिकारियों की पदोन्नति के लिए नियम

1587. **श्री सूर्यभान पाटील वहाडणे** : क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या भारतीय वायुसेना में ग्राउण्ड ड्यूटी अधिकारियों और फ्लाइंग अधिकारियों को पदोन्नति के नियम एक समान हैं;

(ख) यदि हां, तो हाल ही में अधिकारियों को विंग कमांडर के पद पर पदोन्नति देते समय पदोन्नति बोर्ड ने समान योग्यता रखने के बावजूद प्रशासनिक शाख के कम और हवाई उड़ान करने के कार्य में लगी शाख के अधिक अधिकारियों की पदोन्नति क्यों की;

(ग) इस कदम से प्रशासनिक शाख में व्याप्त रोष कम करने के लिए क्या कदम उठाये गये हैं;

(घ) क्या पुनरीक्षा करते समय वायुसेना में प्रशासनिक अधिकारियों के पदों को न्यूनतम आवश्यकता के स्तर पर पहुंचा दिया गया हैं; और

(ङ) यदि हां, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं?

रक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री एन0 वी0 एन0 सोमू) : (क) ग्राउण्ड ड्यूटी अफसरों और उड़ान शाख अफसरों के लिए पदोन्नति के नियम समान नहीं हैं परन्तु मिलत-जुलते हैं और वायुसेना की भूमिका और जरूरतों पर आधारित हैं।

(ख)पदोन्नतियां प्रत्येक शाख में किसी वर्ष विशेष में उपलब्ध रिक्तियों की संख्या पर निर्भर करती हैं और ये वायुसेना की भूमिका तथा अपेक्षाओं को ध्यान में